3/17/70

Dear Harold,

LIFTON: I was not aware that you objected to this so strongly, and I am now sorry that I did initiate a correspondance. I think it is entirely possible for me to back out of it by saying that I think we have nothing for each other. I am also very sorry that this upset you as I take it it did.

(I don't mean to come off as brisk or terse or even angry--I am not, but I am very, very rushed.)

PHONE FIL: I would like to know what conclusions you reached as to what things Fil has seen. I told you mine when I was there. I think he is saythg that he has seen suppressed autopsy material which causes him to doubt the official story. Do he give a clue as to where they are? And, I add, what they are. I think it is possible that his friend Pierre showed them to him for it wasn't the Archives. And I think it very possible that they are autopsy notes. He knew right off that they were not printed by the WC as the tape reflects where the transcript cannot. As soon as I told him these weren't printed by WC, he smiled, shook his head, and said, "That's right; they're not." And as soon as I said a search had been made of the Archives he told me that they wouldn't be found there, hesitating a moment and adding "because everybody knows what's in there." And also note that I asked him if he knew if the notes were in existance. "As of now?" he asked. I said yes and he then said no. As of 3 months ago I should have asked. What are your conlusions?

I believe when he says that they can't come off bullet base he means the JFK neck fragments--that is the impression the tape gives. I think you make too much of the WC's double printing of Z283 with ommission of 284. Remember that what of JFK shows in 284 is visible at the top of what is ptinted as 285 and nothing unusual--no head damage. Nor do I agree that the sudden forward motion before 313 is by JFK and not by Z. But I do agree that the whole body is involved in the backward movement and that the leftward pivot is slow and lateral as you point out. I think the possibilities aren't as slima s he puts them. 2 shooters far apart fired rifles of varying velocities could fire at different times and have their bullets hit at almost the same time.

Dick didn't send anyone my Specter interview--he just told some that I had interviewed Specter. I think Dick knows better than to violate our confidence. And this I want in nobody's hands except our own. It is quite valuable to my book for here I put to Specter many of the charges I (YOU?) make against him and he could not answer one.

ALTGENS: Actually, the photo printed by Tink to refute the presence of cracks prior to 255 shows them the best. I have tried for two years to account for what might cause the mark to appear and I though maybe you or Dick would see what I could have missed. What do I make of things if this is true? I means that a shot prior to 255 fragmented in the car. I would pick as most likely the Connally hit--fragment could easily have gone from chest to widdshield. I do agree with you on the possibilities involved with washing down the car but while we know that it was washed, we don't know what else was done. And I am convinced that the MC was never used in JFK. It is possible but just that that it hit JBC.

RAP BROWN: Have been following this but nothing good in the papers. I did see a lot on TV like the interviews with the FBI explosives experts, the medical examiner, plus a black senator(?) who was "convinced" by the finding of the other two men. I myself have been suspicious of this as I have been of many things thanks to the great precident set in a case which some consider very important--assassination of whatisname--John Kennedy?

My history teacher infuriates me. He is close to being a fascist, if he is not one already. I told him of the suit ("liberals never try to get things done through the proper channels") and he said that you are wrong in suing, that the government has the right to suppress what it wants if it deems it in the national interest. And if it must also break its own laws? Yes, it has that right. This man thinks we should have complete faith in the government. We should just forget about JFK and all that. The government has worked in the national interest and we should accept what it said even if it is totally wrong. It wouldn't have done this if it didn't think it was right. Need I express my disgust and anguish?

About the suit in a separate letter.

Rushed,

Jack

P.S. What Fil says about removal of materials on p. 5 is all he said on that, and I don't know how reliable it is. You further say that I am in error in saying fragments were in the neck, "I am pretty certai lower." Please explain. I have seen nothing to suggest that they were lower and I believe the Morgan letter places them on the level of the 7th cervical.

Your letter to Rhoads is beautiful--thanks for thinking of me by sending a carbon. (I have a way to read carbons of poor quality so it's a lot easier now). I have a suggestion for further writing to the Archs. Why don't you put your requests in numbered order--itemize them. This is what I do so that when Eckhoff answers me, he can merely indicate the date of my letter to which he is responding, then number and similarly itemize the answers. This avoids much confusion, eliminates any excuses they can make about the request not being clear, and makes it easier for you when you review what you've asked forX plus what they've answered. I got this idea when going through your correspondance with them.